

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 4-8, 14-19 and 23-27 remain pending in this application. By this amendment, Claim 4 has been amended. As the amendments to Claim 4 are directed to formal matters, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not falling within one of the four categories of invention.


Applicant hereby expresses appreciation for the grant of a personal interview on April 28, 2009. During that interview the Examiner suggested that the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 would be remedied by amending the claim language to clarify that the steps of the method are performed by a circuit (including the code divider and decoder), so as to satisfy the requirements as set forth in the *Bilski* decision.

Pursuant to the discussion during the interview, Claim 4 has been amended to recite a method implemented by a circuit, receiving said content through an input, dividing the detected watermark information into the component codes in a code divider circuit, decoding each of the component codes in a decoder circuit, and outputting from an output. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 4 as amended is tied to a particular machine. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection thereof under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that Claim 4 be allowed. Each of Claims 5-8, 14-19, and 23-27 having been previously allowed, it is respectfully requested that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Michael L. Gellner
Registration No. 27,256

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)